



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/691,288	10/21/2003	John A. Pomfret	CTC-1	2250

7590 11/09/2004

IRA S. DORMAN
Suite 200
330 Roberts Street
East Hartford, CT 06108

EXAMINER

FUNK, STEPHEN R

ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER

2854

DATE MAILED: 11/09/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/691,288

Applicant(s)

POMFRET, JOHN A.

Examiner

Stephen R Funk

Art Unit

2854

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 2 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☐ Responsive to communication(s) filed on ____.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☒ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-24 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) ____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) ____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☐ Claim(s) ____ is/are rejected.
- 7) ☒ Claim(s) 1-24 is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) ____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☒ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 21 October 2003 is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☒ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. ____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date ____.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. ____.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: ____.

Art Unit: 2854

This application is in condition for allowance except for the following formal matters:

The disclosure is objected to because of the following informalities: The specification uses different terminology, e.g. “collar” and “interference band”, to refer to the same element (14). Appropriate correction is required.

The drawings are objected to because the collar (14) is not adequately illustrated in Figures 1, 5, or 6. While the specification states on page 4 lines 8 - 10 that the collar reduces the internal diameter of the bore (12) none of the figures adequately illustrate this reduced diameter. Overall, the quality of the drawings is poor.

Corrected drawing sheets in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121(d) are required in reply to the Office action to avoid abandonment of the application. Any amended replacement drawing sheet should include all of the figures appearing on the immediate prior version of the sheet, even if only one figure is being amended. The figure or figure number of an amended drawing should not be labeled as “amended.” If a drawing figure is to be canceled, the appropriate figure must be removed from the replacement sheet, and where necessary, the remaining figures must be renumbered and appropriate changes made to the brief description of the several views of the drawings for consistency. Additional replacement sheets may be necessary to show the renumbering of the remaining figures. The replacement sheet(s) should be labeled “Replacement Sheet” in the page header (as per 37 CFR 1.84(c)) so as not to obstruct any portion of the drawing figures. If the changes are not accepted by the examiner, the applicant will be notified and informed of any required corrective action in the next Office action. The objection to the drawings will not be held in abeyance.

Claims 1 - 24 are objected to because of the following informalities:

In claim 1 page 7 line 18, claim 6 line 1, claim 8 page 9 line 8, claim 13 line 1, claim 17 page 11 line 8, and claim 24 line 1 “inside” should be --inner--.

In claim 14 lines 3 and 4 “slot-defining structure” should simply be --slot-- so as to be consistent with the original recitation in claim 14 line 2. In line 5 “spindle contact means” lacks proper antecedent basis. Possibly, this recitation is referring to the “external contact means” recited in claim 8 line 3.

In claim 17 page 11 lines 15 - 16 "slot-defining structure" should simply be --slot-- so as to be consistent with the original recitation in claim 17 page 11 line 14. In claim 17 penultimate line "spindle contact means" lacks proper antecedent basis. Possibly, this recitation is referring to the "external contact means" recited in claim 17 line 3.

Appropriate correction is required.

The specification is objected to as failing to provide proper antecedent basis for the claimed subject matter. See 37 CFR 1.75(d)(1) and MPEP § 608.01(o). Correction of the following is required:

In claim 8 lines 3 - 5 and claim 17 lines 3 - 5 it is recited that the plurality of groove structures *extend axially* along at least said shaft portion (25) of the spindle. Presumably, this recitation refers to the slots (24). However, only one (26) of the slots (24) extends axially along the shaft (25). See page 4 lines 15 - 20 and Figure 1. As recited, it appears that all of the slots (24) extend axially along the length of the shaft, whereas in fact, only one slot extends axially along the shaft as channel (26). See again page 4 lines 18 - 19. See also claim 14 and the last five lines of claim 17. Although the claims are clear in themselves, they appear to be inconsistent with the remaining disclosure. Accordingly, it appears that the claims, rather than the specification and drawings, should be amended to clarify the relationship between the groove structures (slots 24) and the slot (channel 26). Furthermore, it is confusing that applicant refers to element (24) as slots in the specification but element (26) as a slot in the claims.

Claims 1 - 24 would be allowable if rewritten or amended to overcome the objections set forth in this Office action.

Prosecution on the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

A shortened statutory period for reply to this action is set to expire **TWO MONTHS** from the mailing date of this letter.

The following is an examiner's statement of reasons for allowability: The prior art of record does not teach or properly render obvious the total recited combination including, in particular, a core having both a stop means and a collar structure for engaging a spindle. While both Seybold et al. ('677) and Puckett et al. ('551) show in Figure 1 stop means (42, 38) on the inner surface of a core there is no structure corresponding to the recited collar structure. Moreover, there is no proper motivation to provide the core of Seybold et al. or Puckett et al. with a collar structure since it is disclosed that the stop means (42, 38) sufficiently provides the desired function of locating the core on the spindle.


Any comments considered necessary by applicant must be submitted no later than the payment of the issue fee and, to avoid processing delays, should preferably accompany the issue fee. Such submissions should be clearly labeled "Comments on Statement of Reasons for Allowance."

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Stephen R. Funk whose telephone number is (571) 272-2164.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Drew Hirshfeld, can be reached at (571) 272-2168.

The fax phone number for ALL official papers is (703) 872-9306. Upon consulting with the examiner *unofficial* papers only may be faxed directly to the examiner at (571) 273-2164.

SRF
November 3, 2004


STEPHEN R. FUNK
PRIMARY EXAMINER